



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

war continued for the purpose of securing money indemnity. And it was that public opinion that brought about peace between the contending nations.

I wish, Mr. President, that it were within my power to impress the Senate with my own conviction of the duty which we owe to the world, to humanity, to all future generations, to consummate this first great act of world statesmanship—to lay this corner-stone in the temple of universal law and justice. I have little patience with those who pronounce as a fanciful dream the prophecy of the dawn of a day when nations shall be governed in their relations with each other by the same code of morals which every State exacts of its own people in their inter-relations. The sentiment of the people of the civilized world is today against all international injustice. But so long as there is no power other than the unrestrained will of a greedy government to restrain it from unjust acts, so long will the stronger of such governments rob and plunder the weaker.

In the slow evolution of the human race there came a time when the consensus of all the people declared that the individual should no longer be arbitrator of his differences with his neighbor; that justice and right should no longer be measured according to the judgment of him who could wield the biggest club. And they placed their united strength and their unbiased judgment against the distorted idea of right as entertained by the man with the bigger club.

I fancy many men in that far-off period assumed and declared that this invasion was contrary to human proclivities, and so long as human nature retained the element of greed and injustice the strong would override the weak. And undoubtedly many of those of a bellicose disposition declared that it would be hypocritical to create a court to try those differences when, as a matter of fact, the individual did not intend to allow any tribunal to govern him in what he deemed a matter of his own business.

But they did create a court, and they did obey that court, backed, as it was, by the whole power of society. And because of that restraint we have all we know of twentieth-century civilization.

Mr. President, we have today reached another stage in world progression, whereby we purpose to force, by the power of the world's sentiment, supplemented by the combined obligation of national compacts of every nation to abide by the same code of morals in their international relations that they in turn exact from their subjects, namely, that they rob no other nation of its honor, that they steal not its territory, that they murder not its people; and I sincerely hope that the great Government of the United States will be the first government that shall attempt to lay the corner-stone of this edifice of international justice.

Christianity and the Peace Movement. An Appeal to the Churches.

By Edward L. Parsons.

In an article on "The War Against War," in a recent *Atlantic Monthly*, Mr. Havelock Ellis, enumerating the factors making toward permanent international peace, dismisses Christianity from among them with the remark: "The influence of the religion of peace has in this matter been less than nil."

The judgment is too sweeping. It ignores much that the Christian church has done; but it is a grievous thing that it can be uttered at all. It is a grievous thing that there is so much truth in it. The Christian church has never stood as it ought to stand toward the peace movement. It has never in determined and thorough fashion preached the abolition of war as an immediate and pressing business of Christian people. It has been inert and unprotesting while nations have built armies and navies, trained their citizens for war, and accepted war as a normal phase of life. It has failed to see the implications of its own principles.

The great and terrible indictment against Christianity in this matter, against thousands of Christian ministers and myriads of Christian people, is that they are afraid. They will not trust their religion. They will not trust humanity, nor the might of truth and righteousness. They profess a religion of faith in God and man. They profess to believe in a moral world order. They profess to believe that it was better to sustain the kingdom of God by sacrifice and death than by twelve legions of angels. "Thinkest thou that I cannot beseech my Father, and he shall even now send me more than twelve legions of angels?" spoke Christ at His trial, and His followers profess to rejoice that He would not pray for the aid of the legions. All this they profess, but when it comes to war and the preparation for war they are afraid to trust God and humanity. They like guns and steel plate better, and have much to say of the disgrace of "peace at any price."

Let us look at the matter more closely, endeavoring to understand it not in the light of international politics, but in that of Christianity alone. War is successfully routed from the modern world. It has gone with slavery and polygamy and other evils into the class of institutions which no one defends. They all exist more or less, but their fight is a losing fight.

We have no longer to argue against war. We may assume that it is bad. When, however, we try to touch the conscience of the Christian world upon the matter, we encounter two kinds of difficulties. There are those who say that although war is bad, it cannot very well be done away. Men, as long as they are men, will have passions, and now and again these passions will break out in war. Of course, we do not want it, but we must expect it. For a Christian there is only one reply to such opinion. It is unworthy, inconsistent, faithless! The Christian's faith is a faith in miracles. He believes that the most fearful passions can be tamed. It is a faith in righteousness. He believes that evil must be conquered. It is a faith in God. He believes that the future—the only future to which he can look forward—is God's future. These are facts about the Christian's faith which cannot be doubted. In face of them, how can Christian men, even Christian ministers, let such dull faithlessness beset them? They do not want to be dreamers, they say—but dreamers? It is the dreamers who inherit the earth. It is to the dreamer that the future belongs, not to the literalist and the practical man. The practical man judges men by those he sees in the street. The dreamer knows them better, for he judges them by Jesus Christ. No, the Christian faith gives us no standing ground for hopelessness. If war is evil and unrestrained, passion is evil; if there are better ways of settling things than by force, then war must go.

Much greater difficulty faces us, however, in this matter when we come to the large class of people who are earnestly or at any rate professedly in favor of peace, but who advocate big navies and great armies and fortified canals and harbors, and are filling the air with warnings lest arbitration go too far. What is the matter with these people, statesmen, ministers, men in the street? The matter is that they are afraid. They are not willing to take risks for righteousness. They fear to leave their own causes to the test of calm judgment. Three foundations of all Christian ethics they forget—trust, courage, and humility. Now, it is the business of the churches to teach men these things, and it can be plainly shown that these things are literally and really involved in some of the questions which face the movement for peace in international relations.

There is, first, the matter of armaments. The evil of the steadily increasing armies and navies of the world needs no detailed exposition here. It is sufficient to emphasize a few points. It involves colossal unproductive expenditure of wealth. A great university can be maintained at the annual cost of one of our modern battleships. It involves a hopeless and endless competition. No nation vying with other nations can reach the limit until money fails. It cultivates the wrong spirit. Wherever men think and talk of war they make war easier. That is human nature. It is also good psychology.

But with all this evil recognized, the answer comes back: "We cannot help ourselves. We must be prepared. Others are. We are really promoting peace by preparing for war. If we are strong, no one will attack us." The specious plea, backed by appeal to the judgment of great statesmen of the past, is familiar. It is usually met by emphasizing the evils I have just noted.

But the Christian church ought to meet it by going to the very root of the matter and showing that it is an utterly un-Christian attitude. It violates the Christian principle of faith in humanity. Here we are at peace with all the world. No one imagines for a moment that any nation wants to fight us. Yet in the face of peace we are suspicious; in the frank friendship with the world we are untrusting. We give our hand to another nation, saying "brother!" and fling our battle fleet before him that our brother nation may know that we do not really trust him. We are prepared to thrash him if he offends us.

The Christian minister needs to be always crying out, "In quietness and confidence is thy strength." Big navy heroism is not heroism at all, any more than it is heroism for a company of well-armed soldiers to mow down a lot of naked savages. Las Casas, not Cortez, is the real Christian hero.

Christianity knows that only peace built upon moral grounds, on justice and confidence and trust, is a permanent peace. It is Christianity's business to try to bring the nations to that view, and therefore Christianity will take the chances for that kind of peace. It will trust the other nations. It will say "brother" and mean "brother." It will have confidence that the appeal to the best will call forth the best.

It seems hardly necessary in this connection to speak of the incident of the fortification of the Panama Canal, yet I am led to do so because it was when that question was before Congress that we heard on every side the

plea: "We cannot take the chances. We must be prepared to defend the canal as part of our coast line."

We cannot take the chances! That is to say, we dare not trust other nations. We dare not assume that war with any great nation is for us out of question. We dare not take this opportunity to advance the spirit of international brotherhood because we do not trust. Such sentiments may be fitting in practical statesmen, Congressmen, and Senators, army and navy officers whose business makes them distrustful; but what of Christian ministers; what of the people of the churches? Such sentiments—and they were uttered by many—show a complete failure to understand the elementary principles of Christianity. It is just that kind of thing that the church has been doing all along; missing her chances by being cautious, conservative, practical, when she ought to be daring, radical, visionary. That is her business. She doesn't inherit the earth, she doesn't see the kingdom of God come, because she does not dare enough.

Precisely the same general considerations bear upon the great question of arbitration, which today is that of special interest to the English and French speaking world.

The principle of arbitration of international controversies is now so well accepted that no one would be likely to have the temerity to question it; but when it comes to the application of the principle, when it is proposed to make it thoroughly comprehensive so that it is hard to see any loophole at all, the outcry begins, and the burden of the outcry is that we cannot trust any one but ourselves.

The discussion of the constitutional questions involved in the arbitration treaties now before the Senate may be left to the lawyers. The unprejudiced lay mind can see only quibbling in the report of the Senate committee. What concerns us here is the question of the Christian attitude toward unlimited arbitration. How does Christianity meet the current objections to it?

Men say that we must be extraordinarily careful lest other nations get us into trouble under treaties which throw practically every matter of dispute into the arbitration court. They will raise all manner of questions. Causes of war will be constantly brought forward. We must be careful, say the Senate committee, lest that which we meant for peace lead actually to war. More than one distinguished representative of the churches has endorsed this view. Indeed, as we read the arguments used against the treaties we find that through and through there runs the supposition that other nations will try to get the better of us. It seems to be forgotten that England and France are to take the same chances which we take, that they have assented already to the treaties. It seems to be assumed that our motives are unimpeachable, but that we cannot trust other peoples! Distrust is the note of these objections.

In the face of such sentiments let the Christian church recall her Master's condemnation of him who thanked God that he was not as other men are. It is utterly un-Christian to distrust. It is bad morals, bad psychology, bad politics as well. But our concern is only to note that it is bad Christianity. It is just when an opportunity to take some risk of this kind faces us that the churches must urge the nation on. They must say to us, "Dare to risk it. Trust in others will justify

itself. It is cowardly to seek refuge in qualifications. It is false to the banner of Christ. Christ is the great adventurer. He prefers the chances of the cross to the certainties of the twelve legions of angels. Let us follow him."

But still the objector, the ardent patriot who considers himself alone the safeguard of his country, presses us. There are some things no nation would consent to arbitrate. Perhaps so, but it is hard to name any that any other nation would expect us to arbitrate concerning which the other nation would not take equal chances with ourselves. "But our honor may be touched. The existing treaties should specifically exempt matters which concern our honor, vital interests, or independence." Now, of course, it is preposterous to think that our independence would be called in question. But what do honor and vital interests mean when urged by the objector. They mean only this: that we hold in reserve as not capable of arbitration what *we* think concerns our honor. It is here again that the Christian view interposes itself. There is no such thing as honor in a man unless it is righteous honor. The only honor any man or any nation can have is the honor of being right. And if we are right, why do we need to fear an impartial court? Why do we need to think our honor is not maintained by putting our case before a great tribunal? As has been pointed out, England felt her honor touched in the Alabama claims; but at last she consented to arbitration. Justice, as we think, was done. England yielded, and does any Christian man dare say that it was not more honorable for her to yield to the decision than to fight? "Would we submit," one fiery warrior has asked, "to having our ships searched, as in 1812?" Assuredly not (even if such an absurd supposition may be allowed for the argument's sake); but if we protested and brought the case to arbitration, what more honorable thing could we do?

For the Christian, at any rate, this appeal to careful judicial decision, this opportunity for calm consideration, must be the only kind of appeal worth considering. He knows that might never settled right, and he knows that right alone makes honor.

Exactly the same may be said of the plea of the distinguished citizen who a few years ago received the Nobel Prize for his services to the peace cause, that the peace of righteousness is the only peace worth having. All Christian men will agree in that judgment; but as the protagonist of righteousness develops his theme, it appears that one fundamental Christian virtue is forgotten—the virtue of humility. So far as one can understand his reasoning, it is that a righteous peace is one which we enforce according to our own standards. "Righteousness and our national policy," as has been well said, "appear to be synonymous in his mind."

The entire plea forgets the other side. It assumes that we can trust no one else to see moral values aright; that humility, which alone leads man or nation into true righteousness, is completely denied. God's revelation is limited to a chosen race. It is the baldest skepticism in masquerade. It leads inevitably to the doctrine that might makes right. The big stick is the natural weapon of the skeptic.

But all that is not Christianity. Christianity believes in peace. It believes only in righteous peace; but it believes equally that the way to get righteous peace

is by moral means, by appeal to the best in man, by trust and confidence, by bringing to bear all that facts and reason can show, in order that justice may be established. It may be, as the President has well said, that now and then arbitration will "bite." We may lose even when our claim is just, but that is honorable defeat. It is righteous defeat. Shall we take no risks? I say again that Christianity is a religion of risks. It has the sublime courage which trusts in righteousness and truth. It will dare the chances of the cross rather than rest upon the certainties of the twelve legions of angels. In a word, Christianity will strive to bring the nations to the consistent acceptance of the very principles which underlie their growing democracy. Democracy is the political expression of Christianity. It is founded upon faith in man. It could not live a moment except upon faith.

The Christian church, then, if she understands her own fundamental principles, must support the peace movement, not only by presenting an ideal, but by urging the substitution of trust for suspicion, of the courage of faith for the courage born of the great armament, of the humility which may own the possibility of being wrong for the pride which confuses one's own position with eternal righteousness.

It is precisely the peace of righteousness which Christianity seeks. To secure that, it will call other nations brothers, and trust them. It will put aside suspicion. It will take chances. It will have the courage of faith. It will refuse to call for the twelve legions of angels.

The great and terrible indictment against Christianity in this matter of world peace against hundreds of thousands of ministers and millions of Christian people, is that they are afraid. Let us be afraid no longer. Let us trust God and humanity.

BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA.

World Peace.

By Sister M. Fides Shepperson.

It is a pleasurable relief for the serious student of history to lift his eyes from the blood-red records of the past, and let them turn with kindlier hope toward the Peace Palace of The Hague, the Knox anticipative International Court of Arbitral Justice, the glorious possibilities for world peace that lie potential in the late kingly gift of Andrew Carnegie, and the unconditional peace treaties recently agreed upon by the representatives of three leading nations of the world—our own country, France, and England—and now awaiting the ratification of the Senate.

Will wars cease? *No*, thunders the past; not yet, says the present; yes, whispers the future.

And yet, whatever the outcome, the third of August, 1911—the day of the signing of the treaties—will stand as a red-letter day in the annals of history. The well-known picture portraying the signing of the treaties will, sooner or later, take its place among the influences of enduring good. The gratified smile of President Taft, the tense interest of the witnesses, the rugged earnestness of England's representative, Ambassador Bryce, and of our own Secretary of State, Philander C. Knox, and atmospherically o'er all and in all, the tremendous significance and age-deep interests there represented make the picture unique.